

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Garnett DuBose, # 189764,) C/A No. 8:08-2533-PMD-BHH
)
)
Petitioner,)
)
vs.) Report and Recommendation
)
Warden Allendale Correctional Institution,)
)
)
Respondent.)

Background of this Case

The petitioner is an inmate at the Allendale Correctional Institution of the South Carolina Department of Corrections (SCDC). He is serving a two-year sentence on a probation violation conviction entered in the Court of General Sessions for Sumter County on November 9, 2007. The petitioner's underlying convictions were for forgery, burglary, and petit larceny. The petitioner's original convictions were entered in the Court of General Sessions for Sumter County in December of 1992. At that time, the petitioner was sentenced to seven (7) years, which was suspended to three (3) years incarceration and two (2) years of probation. The petitioner indicates that he left South Carolina in August of 2004, with permission from South Carolina probation authorities, to attend his mother's funeral in Michigan. The petitioner did not return to South Carolina by his appointed deadline, and a probation violation arrest warrant was issued in March of 1995. On

June 20, 2007, the petitioner was arrested in Michigan on a misdemeanor offense and the outstanding South Carolina arrest warrant was then discovered by Michigan authorities. The petitioner served a seventy-day sentence on the Michigan charge. The petitioner was extradited to South Carolina in August or September of 2007. The petitioner appeared before the Court of General Sessions for Sumter County on November 9, 2007. The petitioner's probation was revoked and he was sentenced to serve two (2) years in prison.

The petitioner did not file a direct appeal from his conviction for the probation violation. He did file a petition for writ of habeas corpus in the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of South Carolina. The petitioner states that the Supreme Court of South Carolina denied that petition pursuant to its holding in *Key v. Currie*, 305 S.C. 115, 406 S.E.2d 356 (1991). The petitioner raises one (1) ground in the Section 2254 petition filed in the case at bar: the State of South Carolina violated the petitioner's Due Process Rights by waiting thirteen years to seek the petitioner's extradition.¹

Discussion

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* petition and the Form AO 240 (motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*) pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and the Anti-Terrorism and

¹The petitioner has a pending Section 2241 action concerning the sentence calculation of the petitioner's max-out date by the South Carolina Department of Corrections, *Dubose v. Warden*, Civil Action No. 8:08-2031-PMD-BHH. Service of process was authorized in Civil Action No. 8:08-2031-PMD-BHH on July 2, 2008.

Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996. The review² has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Maryland House of Correction*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995)(*en banc*); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); *Boyce v. Alizaduh*, 595 F.2d 948 (4th Cir. 1979) (recognizing the district court's authority to conduct an initial screening of any *pro se* filing);³ *Loe v. Armistead*, 582 F.2d 1291 (4th Cir. 1978); and *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). The petitioner is a *pro se* litigant, and thus his pleadings are accorded liberal construction. See *Erickson v. Pardus*, 75 U.S.L.W. 3643, 167 L.Ed.2d 1081, 127 S.Ct. 2197 (U.S., June 4, 2007)(*per curiam*); *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9-10 & n. 7 (1980)(*per curiam*); and *Cruz v. Beto*, 405 U.S. 319 (1972). When a federal court is evaluating a *pro se* complaint or petition, the plaintiff's or petitioner's allegations are assumed to be true. *Fine v. City of New York*, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2nd Cir. 1975). Even under this less stringent standard, the petition is subject to summary dismissal. The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Department of Social Services*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990).

²Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (DSC), the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

³Boyce has been held by some authorities to have been abrogated in part, on other grounds, by *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989) (insofar as *Neitzke* establishes that a complaint that fails to state a claim, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), does not by definition merit *sua sponte* dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) [formerly 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d)], as "frivolous").

With respect to his conviction and sentence for the probation violation, the petitioner's sole federal remedies are a writ of habeas corpus under either 28 U.S.C. § 2254 or 28 U.S.C. § 2241, which remedies can be sought only after the petitioner has exhausted his state court remedies. "It is the rule in this country that assertions of error in criminal proceedings must first be raised in state court in order to form the basis for relief in habeas. Claims not so raised are considered defaulted." *Beard v. Green*, 523 U.S. 371, 375 (1998) (*citing Wainwright v. Sykes*, 433 U.S. 72 (1977)). See also 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b); *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court*, 410 U.S. 484, 490-91 (1973); *Picard v. Connor*, 404 U.S. 270 (1971); *Schandlmeier v. Cunningham*, 819 F.2d 52, 53 (3rd Cir. 1986) (exhaustion required under § 2241).

The exhaustion requirements under § 2254 are fully set forth in *Matthews v. Evatt*, 105 F.3d 907 (4th Cir. 1997):

In the interest of giving state courts the first opportunity to consider alleged constitutional errors occurring in a defendant's state trial and sentencing, a § 2254 petitioner is required to "exhaust" all state court remedies before a federal district court can entertain his claims. Thus, a federal habeas court may consider only those issues which have been "fairly presented" to the state courts. . . .

To satisfy the exhaustion requirement, a habeas petitioner must fairly present his claim to the state's highest court. The burden of proving that a claim has been exhausted lies with the petitioner.

The exhaustion requirement, though not jurisdictional, is strictly enforced[.]

Matthews v. Evatt, 105 F.3d at 910-11 (citations omitted from quotation).

In any event, it is clear that the petitioner has not exhausted his state court remedies. Exhaustion of state court remedies is required by 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1)(A).

The petitioner's counsel at the probation violation hearing did not file a direct appeal. A direct appeal is the first step taken by a recently-convicted South Carolina prisoner to exhaust his or her state court remedies. *State v. Northcutt*, 372 S.C. 207, 641 S.E.2d 873 (2007). It is well settled that a direct appeal is a viable state court remedy. *Castille v. Peoples*, 489 U.S. 346, 349-52 (1989). Since no direct appeal was filed, the petitioner can file an application for post-conviction relief. See S.C. Code Ann. § 17-27-10, *et seq.* The United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit has held that South Carolina's Uniform Post-Conviction Procedure Act is also a viable state-court remedy. See *Miller v. Harvey*, 566 F.2d 879, 880-81 (4th Cir. 1977); and *Patterson v. Leeke*, 556 F.2d 1168, 1170-1173 (4th Cir. 1977).

The applicant in a post-conviction application may allege constitutional violations in a post-conviction proceeding but only if the issue could not have been raised by direct appeal. See *Gibson v. State*, 329 S.C. 37, 41, 495 S.E.2d 426, 428 (1998) (*citing* S.C. Code Ann. § 17-27-20(a)(1), (b); and *Simmons v. State*, 264 S.C. 417, 215 S.E.2d 883 (1975)); and *Drayton v. Evatt*, 312 S.C. 4, 430 S.E.2d 517, 519-20 (1993) (issues that could have been raised at trial or on direct appeal cannot be raised in a PCR application absent a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel). "Exhaustion includes filing of an application, the rendering of an order adjudicating the issues, and petitioning for, or knowingly waiving, appellate review." *Gibson v. State*, 329 S.C. at 42, 495 S.E.2d at 428. The Supreme Court of South Carolina has specifically stated: "[W]hen the claim has been presented to the Court of Appeals or the Supreme Court, and relief has been denied, the litigant shall be deemed to have exhausted all available state remedies." See *In Re*

Exhaustion of State Remedies in Criminal and Post-Conviction Relief Cases, 321 S.C. 563, 564, 471 S.E.2d 454 (1990); and *State v. McKenna*, 348 S.C. 270, 559 S.E.2d 850 (2002).⁴

Applications for post-conviction relief are to be filed in the Court of Common Pleas for the county in which a South Carolina prisoner was convicted in a Court of General Sessions. If a South Carolina prisoner's application for post-conviction relief is denied or dismissed by a Court of Common Pleas, he or she can file an "appeal" (petition for writ of certiorari) in that post-conviction case. See S.C. Code Ann. § 17-27-100; and *Knight v. State*, 284 S.C. 138, 325 S.E.2d 535 (1985).⁵ South Carolina prisoners have been successful on such appeals in their post-conviction cases. See, e.g., *McKnight v. State*, 378 S.C. 33, 661 S.E.2d 354, 358-63 (2008); *Lowry v. State*, 376 S.C. 499, 510-11, 657 S.E.2d 760, 766 (2008) ("Because the unconstitutional jury instruction did not constitute harmless error in Petitioner's murder conviction, we find that there is a reasonable

⁴Where a habeas petitioner has failed to exhaust his state remedies and the state court would now find his or her claims procedurally barred, further exhaustion is not required. See *Coleman v. Thompson*, 501 U.S. 722, 735 n. 1 (1991); and *Breard v. Pruett*, 134 F.3d 615, 619 (4th Cir. 1998). However, the federal court is precluded from hearing a procedurally defaulted claim unless the petitioner can demonstrate cause for the default and actual prejudice as a result of the alleged violation of federal law, or demonstrate that failure to consider the claim will result in a fundamental miscarriage of justice. *Matthews v. Evatt*, 105 F.3d at 916 (quoting *Coleman v. Thompson*, 501 U.S. at 750). This standard has been referred to as a "demanding burden." *Townes v. Murray*, 68 F.3d 840, 847 (4th Cir. 1995).

⁵The Supreme Court of South Carolina has authorized the South Carolina Court of Appeals to hear petitions for certiorari in post-conviction cases upon referral from the Supreme Court of South Carolina. See Supreme Court Order 2005-08 (C.O. 08 effective May 1, 2005), Shearouse Advance Sheet # 19; and *Dunlap v. State*, 371 S.C. 585, 641 S.E.2d 431 (2007) ("In appeals from criminal convictions **or post-conviction relief matters**, a litigant is not required to petition for rehearing and certiorari following an adverse decision of the Court of Appeals in order to be deemed to have exhausted all available state remedies respecting a claim of error.")(emphasis in original).

probability that, but for counsel's failure to object to the unconstitutional jury instruction, the outcome of the trial would have been different."); *Staggs v. State*, 372 S.C. 549, 643 S.E.2d 690 (2007) (post-conviction relief granted on grounds of trial counsel's actual conflict of interest from representing members of same family; new trial ordered); *Custodio v. State*, 373 S.C. 4, 644 S.E.2d 36 (2007) (post-conviction relief granted on issue of enforcement of plea agreement); *Morris v. State*, 371 S.C. 278, 639 S.E.2d 53 (2006) (on issue of ineffective assistance of counsel); *Riddle v. Ozmint*, 369 S.C. 39, 631 S.E.2d 70 (2006); *Stevens v. State*, 365 S.C. 309, 617 S.E.2d 366 (2005); and *Vaughn v. State*, 362 S.C. 163, 607 S.E.2d 72, 73-76 (2004).

The General Assembly has enacted a one-year limitations period for post-conviction cases. See 1995 S.C. Acts 7, which has been codified at S.C. Code Ann. § 17-27-45 (2008); *Sutton v. State*, 361 S.C. 644, 606 S.E.2d 779 (2004); and *Peloquin v. State*, 321 S.C. 468, 469-70, 409 S.E.2d 606, 607 (1996). Cf. *Leamon v. State*, 363 S.C. 432, 611 S.E.2d 494 (2005) (prisoner's incarceration in another jurisdiction does not toll limitations period of § 17-27-45); and *Green v. State*, 353 S.C. 29, 30, 576 S.E.2d 182, 183 (2003) (the filing of a federal § 2254 petition does not toll the one-year limitations period of S.C. Code Ann. § 17-27-45).

The petitioner's writ of habeas corpus filed in the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of South Carolina — which was dismissed pursuant to the holding in *Key v. Currie*,

305 S.C. 115, 406 S.E.2d 356 (1991),⁶ on June 25, 2008⁷ — does not satisfy the exhaustion requirement. Under *Durkin v. Davis*, 538 F.2d 1037, 1041-42 (4th Cir. 1976), a petition filed in the original jurisdiction of a State's highest court does not satisfy the exhaustion requirement of 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b).⁸

Since the petitioner has yet to exhaust at least two (2) viable state court remedies — an application for post-conviction relief and an “appeal” (petition for writ of *certiorari*) in the post-conviction case, this court should not keep this case on its docket while the petitioner has yet to exhaust his available state court remedies. See *Galloway v. Stephenson*, 510 F. Supp. 840, 846 (M.D.N.C. 1981): “When state court remedies have not been exhausted, absent special circumstances, a federal habeas court may not retain the case on its docket, pending exhaustion, but should dismiss the petition.” See also *Pitchess v. Davis*, 421 U.S. 482, 490 (1975); and *Lawson v. Dixon*, 3 F.3d 743, 749 n. 4

⁶In *Key v. Currie*, the Supreme Court of South Carolina indicated that “it will not entertain actions filed in its original jurisdiction where the matter can be entertained in the trial courts of this State.” 406 S.E.2d at 357.

⁷The petitioner has attached a copy of the Order of the Supreme Court of South Carolina as an exhibit in his pending Section 2241 action, Civil Action No. 8:08-2031-PMD-BHH. See Entry No. 12-3 in Civil Action No. 8:08-2031-PMD-BHH.

This court may take judicial notice of Civil Action No. 8:08-2031-PMD-BHH. *Aloe Creme Laboratories, Inc. v. Francine Co.*, 425 F.2d 1295, 1296 (5th Cir. 1970). See also *Colonial Penn Ins. Co. v. Coil*, 887 F.2d 1236, 1239 (4th Cir. 1989) (“We note that ‘the most frequent use of judicial notice is in noticing the content of court records.’”); *Mann v. Peoples First National Bank & Trust Co.*, 209 F.2d 570, 572 (4th Cir. 1954) (approving district court’s taking judicial notice of prior suit with same parties: “We think that the judge below was correct in holding that he could take judicial notice of the proceedings had before him in the prior suit to which Mann and the Distilling Company as well as the bank were parties.”); and *United States v. Parker*, 956 F.2d 169, 171 (8th Cir. 1992).

⁸But see *Harris v. Director, Virginia Dept. of Corrections*, ___ F.3d ___, 2008 U.S.App. LEXIS 13510, 2008 WL 2567576 (4th Cir. 2008), which respect to such a filing on the tolling of the limitations period.

(4th Cir. 1993), where the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit noted: "[E]xhaustion is not a jurisdictional requirement, but rather arises from interests of comity between the state and federal courts."

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the § 2254 petition be dismissed *without prejudice and without requiring the respondent to file a return*. See *Allen v. Perini*, 424 F.2d 134, 141 (6th Cir. 1970) (federal district courts have duty to screen habeas corpus petitions and eliminate burden placed on respondents caused by ordering an unnecessary answer or return); *Toney v. Gammon*, 79 F.3d 693, 697 (8th Cir. 1996) ("However, a petition may be summarily dismissed if the record clearly indicates that the petitioner's claims are either barred from review or without merit."); *Baker v. Marshall*, 1995 U.S.Dist. LEXIS 4614, *2-*3, 1995 WL 150451 (N.D. Cal., March 31, 1995) ("The District Court may enter an order for the summary dismissal of a habeas petition if it plainly appears from the face of the petition and any exhibits annexed to it that the petitioner is not entitled to relief in this Court."); and the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996. The petitioner's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.

July 22, 2008
Greenville, South Carolina

s/Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States Magistrate Judge

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The petitioner is advised that he may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. **Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.** In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court judge need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must "only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

**Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
Post Office Box 10768
Greenville, South Carolina 29603**

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in the waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984); and *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).